

Date: Mon, 31 Oct 94 04:30:15 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #513
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 31 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 513

Today's Topics:

 CW: Law or Choice ?
 how long to get a license
 I PASSED MY TECH TODAY!!!
 ITU Regulations (2 msgs)
 NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 94 16:24:22 GMT
From: jcumming@dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings)
Subject: CW: Law or Choice ?

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:
: In article <Cy28nF.KA2@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu writes:
: >dismondo@metronet.com (Ray Whitfield) writes:
: >
: >>CW once was the only game in town.
: >>Now it is a part of the game, and one that is loosing popularity daily.
: >
: >>KC5ISS
: >
: >Ray, can you provide us with some data to back up your statement?
: >At least when I claim that about 1/2 the HF QSO's that I hear
: >here in the Central Pacific are conducted via CW, I can back
: >up that claim by showing folks my monitoring log with times,
: >dates, and bands.

: Irrelevant. Manual Morse usage has declined, or been completely
: abandoned, by all of the other radio services for which amateur
: radio is supposed to provide a pool of trained operators. Only
: in amateur radio does use of manual Morse hang on in any substantial
: way, and that only by a regulation mandated self-selected subset of
: the amateur population. The only sound demographic data we have is
: the 1991 ARRL survey that showed that only 38% of the amateur population
: ever used manual Morse *at all*. That says 62% of *coded* amateurs
: never used manual Morse. Since then the advent of code test free
: amateurs has had a remarkable demographic impact on amateur radio,
: and further skewed the numbers against usage of manual Morse.

If I may add, Jeff - your method of determining the relative usage of
phone to CW is rather suspect as well. in the first place, it is well
known that you have a prediliction for CW (at least that can be determined
by your many posts). Therefore, I am sure that your data is skewed, and
results in a conclusion that only you have confidence. In like manner, I
have made it known that I am primarily a digital operator, with
occaisional phone and rare CW contacts. Because I spend most of my time
in the data sub-bands, rarely venturing beyond those sub-bands, any
statement claiming that CW and phone hardly even exist (!), would be
absurd.

Secondly, your methodology seems to be inadequate. I doubt that an
individual could possibly sample the various parts of the spectrum in
order to determine the occupancy with one reciever. In order to collect
reliable data, one could montior the bands with many, many receivers at
the same time (a horrendously awkward and expensive undertaking) or a
scanning method which samples the frequencies for the mode in question
(not an easy task!), and there are other methods which are probably
collect better data.

: It is not surprising that the mandated by regulation A1 segments of
: HF only have A1 operation, and only by amateurs who have been selected
: for manual Morse skills by testing regulations, but that's an artifact
: of regulation, not a result of an open competition between various modes.
: It's like saying women and blacks weren't interested in voting based on
: their non-participation at the ballot box when voting was restricted by
: law to white landowning males over 21.

From the August issue of QST, the following DXCC awards were awarded:

	Phone	CW
Top of Honor Roll	12	4
New Members	73	44
Endorsements	271	137

None of the other awards were used in this compilation (Mixed, RTTY, Satellite and band endorsements because, with the exception of RTTY, who knows what the mode usage is.)

The obvious conclusion is more DXCC awards and endorsements are for phone in comparison with CW. Why? The data really doesn't say why - further investigation would be required. For example, it could be speculated that phone operators are much more anxious to get this award than the CW crowd. I doubt it. I would feel more confident that phone operation is more popular. This is more evidence that the assertion that in the Central Pacific one-half of the contacts are CW while the other is phone is rather suspect.

Further to Gary's message, since phone operation seems to be more popular, using the DXCC awards data, why does CW get more spectrum to use than phone does, particularly since it is claim that it is so efficient?

: Gary

: --

: Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
: Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
: 534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!	gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
: Lawrenceville, GA 30244			

If I have said it once, I will say it again. On 01 Feb 99, you won't get out of port even if you have wireless telegraphy onboard if you are travelling ostensibly on the high seas because there ain't gonna be anyone to hear you. CW isn't so wonderful if everyone else - maritime, aeronautical, military, et al., are no longer going to use it. For those who want to use it, fine, go ahead. But it makes no sense to have it as an examination element in order to operate on the HF bands.

73 to all and live better digitally,

Jim, VE3XJ

Date: Sun, 30 Oct 94 17:11:43 GMT
From: smp@agape.sol.net (Steven M. Palm)
Subject: how long to get a license

In article <38j2v6\$b78@bcfreenet.seflin.lib.fl.us>
a001361t@bcfreenet.seflin.lib.fl.us writes:

>

>THANKS THE INDIVIDUALS WHO WROTE TO TELL ME HOW LONG IT TAKES FOR A HAM

>LICENSE TO ARRIVE. FOR ME IT TOOK 7 WEEKS AND 6 DAYS.....
> KE4RLZ

And it took just five weeks here.

N9YTY.

Date: Mon, 31 Oct 1994 02:14:45 GMT
From: wnewkirk@bb.iu.net (William E. Newkirk)
Subject: I PASSED MY TECH TODAY!!!

TOM SUNMAN (tomsunman@aol.com) wrote:
: Now comes the hard part.....waiting for the license!!! What a
: thrill, I can hardly wait!
: Tom Randall
: (waiting for his callsign!)

well at least it should be around 6 weeks instead of 17...8)

73, bill wb9ivr

(but we ARE coming into the holiday season...and people take vacations...
muhahahah...)

Date: 28 Oct 1994 16:48:40 GMT
From: earlix@ix.netcom.com (Larry Earlix)
Subject: ITU Regulations

>So where does one actually FIND the ITU regs? In particular, Article 32
>(which apparently deals with Amateur and Satellite radio signals/regs)?

>
>And why aren't sending tests required of U.S. hams?

>
>Any help to satisfy my curiosity about this would be appreciated!

>
>Thanks, Mitch. N7GOW

>
I got a copy by calling the FCC in Gettysburg. It does say that we
must also show we can send by hand! It also says, however, that the
country issuing the license may test anyway it chooses. There is no
speed requirement or content requirement. One single character, either
sent or received, would satisfy the ITU requirement.

Larry kc6jev@k6ly.#nocal.ca.us.noam

Date: Mon, 31 Oct 1994 02:13:06 GMT
From: wnewkirk@bb.iu.net (William E. Newkirk)
Subject: ITU Regulations

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:
: administer the tests. Now that they have gone to volunteer examiners,
: that point may no longer be an issue, but they've continued to hold
: that a sending test isn't necessary.
: Gary

and of course, when you do a sending test, the judgement of it's "ok-ness"
would be subjective and therefore there would be "easy" test sites and
"hard" test sites. as it stands right now, the VEs ability to subjectively
grade a test is limited. probably a good thing...

bill wb9ivr

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 94 22:10:30 -0500
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

Gary Mitchell <Mitch@lexmark.com> writes:

>Lets say I have a friend who is a programmer (not a ham) and really interested
>in the AX25 protocol (from a technical perspective). Wouldn't the above
>statement rule out amateurs discussing it on the air. The word "ONLY" bugs me.

NOTHING rules out discussing the AX.25 protocol, the ExecJet IIc or the Bosnia
situation in a domestic QSO. (It gets a little stickier in international
contacts.) The prohibition is on ONE-WAY transmissions of material other than
that of interest only to amateurs.

Date: Mon, 31 Oct 1994 02:06:21 GMT
From: wnewkirk@bb.iu.net (William E. Newkirk)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:
: ARRL chain of command since no one seemed to know the proper (legal)
: answer. ARRL HQ advised the 00 to ask the FCC and then inform them
: of the interpretation. He posted the FCC's interpretation to just

: the sysops on packet but it leaked to the world; he's been receiving
: lots of flames due to the leak.

: Go read the full article over on .misc

: Jeff NH6IL

so since the rule was going to be secret, how were the rest of us
supposed to follow it, eh? (sounds like the "double secret probation"
from "animal house", doesn't it?)

bill wb9ivr

Date: 28 Oct 1994 17:00:42 GMT
From: hanko@wv.mentorg.com (Hank Oredson)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <1994Oct24.205835.11821@news.csuohio.edu>, sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf)
writes:

|>
|> The point is being missed. Are packet bulletins addressed to either
|> "all" or a like form of "all" (MUSIC, SEWING, CRAFTS, NAFTA, etc.)
|> indeed informational bulletins?
|>
|> Is there a difference between:
|>
|> 1. My tuning in a W1AW transmission and listening to an ARRL bulletin.
|> 2. My tuning in a packet BBS station and reading an ARRL bulletin.

1. You listen, you are NOT in QSO with anyone.
2. You CONNECT, and are in QSO with the BBS.

1. W1AW has NO CLUE that you are listening.
2. You BBS KNOWS you are connected, and that the two calls are in QSO.

This really cannot be so difficult to understand?

... Hank

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics	Library Operations
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com	"Parts 'R Us!"
Amateur Radio: W0RLI@W0RLI.0R.USA.NOAM	

Date: 30 Oct 1994 02:32:33 GMT
From: pcr@ic.net (phil reed)

References<FiHNuc4w165w@lmr.mv.com> <CyAM6E.6zG@cscsun.rmc.edu>,
<CyAzAH.Er5@hamnet.wariat.org>
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <CyAzAH.Er5@hamnet.wariat.org>, no8m@hamnet.wariat.org (Steve Wolf N08M) says:

>
>>What 'One Way' bulletins??? What this idiot 00 forgets is the each and every
>
>...snip
>
>>David Tiller | Network Administrator | Voice: (804) 752-3710 |
>>dtiller@rmc.edu | n2kau/4 | Randolph-Macon College| Fax: (804) 752-7231 |
>
>
>
>Your reference to "idiot 00" negated the need to reply.
>
>73,
>Steve
> internet : no8m@hamnet.wariat.org

What an amazingly intelligent way to duck out of responding to a cogent argument.

...phil / kb8uoy

Date: 28 Oct 1994 20:15:48 GMT
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<Cy60BB.LMr@news.Hawaii.Edu> <1994Oct24.140426.901@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<102794072745Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject: Re: Kindness and ham radio

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:
:
: [snip]
: >... Speed does not kill, it's that sudden stop
: >that kills. And those sudden stops are mostly precipitated (ignoring

:
: Actually, Gary is quite correct. A major factor is not THE speed, it is
: the DIFFERENCE in speed. By raising the speed limit (posted) to something
: like the average speed you reduce accidents by reducing that difference in
: speed.

: Dan
: --

Sure enough. And while this thread is getting very far from ham
radio, it actually does shed some light on relevant discussions,
believe it or not.

The libertarian would say that since the _difference_ in speed kills,
not the speed itself, they conclude that, since so many people break
the law by speeding, we should raise the speed limit so those slow
law-abiding folk don't cause accidents. Is that logical, or what?

This is the same sort of logic these people apply to amateur radio.
In their own (strangely) logical minds, it makes perfect sense.

How bout if everyone just obeyed the speed limit? Wow, what a
concept, huh? I'm sure your time isn't _that_ valuable.

Try using your logic to explain to someone who's law-abiding loved one
has just been killed by someone going 85 in a 65 zone...explain to
them that it was their loved one's fault for going the speed limit.

It _is_ very interesting to learn how people think about other topics
in life. Consistency can be frightening.

Greg WB0RTK

Date: 29 Oct 1994 08:23:05 GMT
From: mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva)

References<RFM.94Oct24155951@urth.eng.sun.com> <Cy9A6K.CAM@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<38lo8b\$fs0@portal.gmu.edu>
Subject: Re: The (1929) Amateur Code

In <38lo8b\$fs0@portal.gmu.edu> smasters@bzy.gmu.edu (Shawn C. Masters)
writes:

> That's funny. Everyone I know that wants to build gets a
> No-code, since when does code help with desing/building electronics.
> Of course I must agree that most No-coders aren't of this vain.

>
> 73 from a No-code
> Shawn
> KE4GHS
>

I'd like to hear what all these folks are building, since beginning builders who don't have access to HF (where the great majority of beginning building has always occurred) are such a new phenomena to ham radio.

Mike, KK6GM

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #513
